

*December Issue*

The C.A.U.T. *Bulletin*

A Publication

Of The

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION

OF

UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

VOLUME 8 NUMBER 2  
DECEMBER 1959

## REVIEW OF BASIC FRENCH

By WILSON MICKS, *Florida State University*

A grammar designed for students who require a quick review or as a brush-up for graduate students who need a rapid review of the essentials of grammar.

Paperbound

150 pp.

\$1.95

## ANTHOLOGY OF FRENCH LITERATURE, VOLUMES I & II

By R. F. LEGGEWIE, *Pomona College*, and  
HENRI CLOUARD, *member of L'Académie Française*

This two-volume anthology of French poetry, prose and drama contains selections from the Middle Ages to the most recent of contemporary writing (including a play by Sartre and a short story by Camus). The book is written *entirely in French*.

416 pp. each, 32 half-tone illustrations

\$6.50 each

## COLLEGE SPANISH: A New Departure

By WALTER PATTISON, *University of Minnesota*

Following the MLA recommendations for teaching a beginning language this book features the *oral* approach with accompanying records and tapes, the inductive presentation of grammar, and the usage of cultural material in lectures and dialogues written at a mature level.

325 pp. 30 half-tone illustrations, records and tapes      \$4.50

*If you plan to use any of the above books as a text, please ask for your free examination copy.*

EDUCATIONAL DISCOUNT: 20%

**OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS**

**480 University Avenue, Toronto, 2**

# The C.A.U.T. *Bulletin*

*December Issue*

*A publication of*

THE CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

---

Volume 8

December 1959

Number 2

---

**EDITORIAL  
BOARD  
1959-60**

F. S. HOWES, *Editor-in-Chief*  
J. W. BOYES  
H. G. FILES  
J. R. MALLORY

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Academic Freedom and Tenure — An Editorial . . . . .	2
La trahison des clercs — An Editorial . . . . .	4
Academic Freedom in Canada — Frank H. Underhill . . . . .	6
The Crowe Case Again . . . . .	16
A Technologist Looks at Humanism — John Hart . . . . .	17
Salaries and Qualifications of Women Teaching in Canadian Universities and Colleges . . . . .	20
Teaching Positions Open . . . . .	23
News Items . . . . .	24
Staffing the Universities and Colleges of Canada . . . . .	26

---

Published four times a year. Subscription Rate: 1 year for \$2.00  
Executive Secretary Dr. J. H. S. Reid. CAUT National office, Room 603,  
Commonwealth Bldg., 77 Metcalfe St., Ottawa, Ont.

*Editorial Office:* Room 425, Dawson Hall, McGill University, Montreal, P.Q.

*Advertising Office:* Suite 611, 1030 St. Alexander St., Montreal, P. Q.

Telephone: UNiversity 6-1812.

Printed by Quality Press Limited, 1030 St. Alexander St., Montreal.  
Authorized as Second Class Mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa

## ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE

(An Editorial)

"While nearly every university and college in Canada gives *de facto*, if not written, recognition to the principle of tenure, there appear to be only six that have established rules of procedure in dismissal cases, and in half of these the rules were established without either approval by or consultation with faculty. In the opinion of your committee this is an undesirable and potentially dangerous situation. Recent events in Canada give reason to believe that failure to follow acceptable institutional procedures is fraught with grave risks to all concerned." These grave and sober words are extracted from the full and careful report of the C.A.U.T. Committee of Professor G. H. Turner and others at the University of Western Ontario, which was presented to the Council of the C.A.U.T. in Saskatoon last June.

Questions of academic freedom and tenure touch us all and go to the heart of university organization in Canada. They bring up, in its most fundamental form, the question of whether university professors are merely hired hands or are the members of an academic community with rights and obligations which are settled in an atmosphere of law. Where there are established procedures to deal with alleged violation of freedom and tenure we can have some assurance that all will be treated equally and that substantial justice will not only be done but will manifestly be done.

Already the C.A.U.T. has been called upon to act before any such procedural framework has been established. That the Association has acquitted itself well is clear to all. But in these matters, as in many others, prevention is better than cure. It is an encouraging sign that the N.C.C.U.C. has already framed tentative proposals to deal with future academic grievances. These proposals, in their present form, do not cast C.A.U.T. in an acceptable role because they assume that in such disputes C.A.U.T. would necessarily appear *ex parte* on only one side of the

dispute, while the N.C.C.U.C. would assume the guise of an impartial third party. Nevertheless, we ought to continue this matter with N.C.C.U.C. because a procedure which could be endorsed by both them and C.A.U.T. would be highly desirable since it would represent an agreement by the two major parties in the academic community — university administration and university staff.

The question of developing acceptable procedures for dealing with violations of academic freedom and tenure is now the most important business before C.A.U.T. Professor Turner's Committee has furnished a very full and well-documented study of the question which deserves close study by every single association. Violations of academic freedom occur in individual universities and colleges. They are by their nature a local thing, subject to all sorts of local differences. But they touch us all. It is therefore urgent and necessary that each and every local association give careful study to the Turner report so that C.A.U.T. can press for some agreed action which will best serve the vital interests of all associations and all members. It should be possible for this to be done at the next Annual Meeting in 1960.

## LA TRAHISON DES CLERCS

(An Editorial)

This issue of the *Bulletin* includes Mr. John Hart's talk, "A Technologist Looks at Humanism", as a little tract for the times which roused interest when it was broadcast last spring on CBC — Trans Canada, and which may come home with a special force to many university teachers. When Mr. Hart looks at humanism nowadays, he sees less of it in proper health than he likes, for its glory has largely departed, and the power of its persuasion has shrunk. There is still a pervasive use, or misuse, of the grand name, but where is the grand thing to be found? This condition is the tragedy of our civilization, which badly needs a wise, compassionate, articulate humanism, "or we perish".

The blend of dismay and hope with which Hr. Hart regards the humanists is not, one imagines, unique; he is probably spokesman for a good many people. His call to greatness, however, is a flattering but formidable challenge to students and teachers of the humanities. How will they respond to the conviction that they, and only they, by returning from by-paths to their true and essential undertaking, can function as the redeemers or salvagers of the world? Will they live *humbly* with the thought that they alone can save the spell-bound Gothic horde of ignorant men from such bleak stereotypes as "the financier, the labor-organizer, the huckster, and the soldier"? This monopolistic sense of their leadership in the past has been a heady brew for some of them, an overwhelming temptation to intellectual or spiritual pride and snobbery.

It is well to call on the humanist to remember that unless he helps to sustain the hopeful and still possible vision of a world made congenial to the more rational and humane aspirations of men and women, that he and all other people may perish. Wisdom, in Mr. Hart's plan, must take deeper root "first in the universities, then in the governments of nations, and finally in the councils of the world" (Amen to that, and will the press of *all* nations please copy!). The process that Mr. Hart indicates is not



quick and easy; it will take at best a long time to create the broad base of political support for such wisdom; and those who work for it will pray that trigger-happy hot-heads may not undo it in a burst. Meanwhile the broader type of humanist will hope that a larger number of professional philosophers may heed Dr. Morton White's plea for "greater philosophic interest in the problems of history, education, politics, law and religion," and become again the critics and apostles of culture that philosophers have been in the past.

The humanist will probably have greater expectations of the scientists, too, than Mr. Hart appears to entertain. It may be questioned whether scientists will quite agree with his account of them. It is true that attacks are sometimes made on them, but in this age of anxiety what class of men can hope to be immune from some kind of attack? Most scientists, however, as most non-scientists see them, enjoy a very enviable status and reputation. The humanist and the scientist need to be better friends. The humanist will succeed in justifying himself historically only if he enters into a self-respecting alliance with the scientist, which rests firmly on mutuality of support and understanding. The scientist, it is to be hoped, will not dodge all responsibility for what happens in the world through the practical applications of his thinking. He will share it with the professed humanist and the politician and all the others. He will come out of his ivory tower laboratory when possible, and reflect on human concerns as a man and citizen. Unless he can find time and inclination to give some thought to the criticism of human culture, how can he even know whose "message" is worth accepting? Every scientist lives in two worlds, and many scientists have made invaluable contributions to both wisdom and knowledge.

## ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN CANADA\*

Frank H. Underhill

These are some rambling reflections on the subject of academic freedom in Canada. As I discovered after rashly accepting the invitation to speak at this annual meeting of the C.A.U.T., when I began to read a little, the subject in all its ramifications has not received nearly so thorough a discussion in Canada as in the United States. The most enlightening book that I came across among recent writings is an historical one: Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger — *Development of Academic Freedom in the United States* (1955). Metzger in the second half of this volume, dealing with the period since the Civil War, points out that controversies over academic freedom have grown with the emergence of the modern university out of the little liberal arts college. University teaching and research have been professionalized, and the university holds a higher conception of its function in the search for truth than did the old denominational colleges. Hence the university, or some of its professors, has been more apt to clash with the outside public as represented by boards of regents or legislators or newspapers or other interpreters of public opinion.

I should think that we are likely to approach this problem most realistically if we accept the fact that a university will always live in a certain state of tension with the community outside. The blessed state of togetherness is neither attainable nor desirable. But tension may be creative as well as destructive. If university men ever accept the ideal of togetherness either for their own intrauniversity life or for the relations of the university with the outside world, then the university has sunk to be a big business corporation in which they are grey-flannel-suited organization men who deserve whatever may happen to them at the hands of the President and the Chairman of the Board.

Metzger, in his review of leading cases in American university history, makes one point which is specially worth remembering. The successful defence of the professor's right to freedom in teaching or speaking has depended almost always in these test cases on the personality of the president. Where there has been a good president, academic

---

\*This article forms the substance of the address given at the meeting of the C.A.U.T. in the University of Saskatchewan on Saturday evening, June 6, 1959.



freedom has been reasonably safe. Clearly it follows from this that if professors have no more control over the choice of president than they have over the weather, then their own position is precarious.

I have been reading a good deal in the voluminous material devoted to the attempt to define academic freedom. No doubt the C.A.U.T. will have to reach a satisfactory working definition of its own, applicable to Canadian conditions. My own personal feeling remains that the best way to defend academic freedom is to exercise it. As an historian I dislike the methods of the social scientists who spend so much time at the outset of their investigations in defining their terms. The historian tends to reach a definition of what he was studying only at the end of his investigations; and he distrusts too much preliminary definition as being liable to commit you, implicitly and unconsciously, to answering in your definitions all the questions which you should spend the rest of your life investigating. However, we are all sociologists now; and, on the assumption that I am addressing an audience composed entirely of professional or amateur sociologists, I shall preserve my academic respectability by offering a definition.

It is that of Sidney Hook, as given in his book *Heresy Yes, Conspiracy No*. "Academic freedom is a specific kind of freedom. It is the freedom of professionally qualified persons to inquire, to discover, publish and teach the truth as they see it, in the field of their competence, without any control or authority except the control or authority of the rational methods by which truth is established." At another point in his book Professor Hook remarks about academic freedom that "more sloppy rhetoric has been poured out per page, both by those who believe they are supporting it and those intent on criticizing it, than on any other theme, with the possible exception of democracy." At the danger of getting into some of this sloppy rhetoric, I shall now proceed with my reflections on the subject without paying any further attention to the definition that I have accepted.

As to the intra-mural aspects of this question, it is clear that the effective freedom of the individual professor depends upon the degree of self-government which he and his colleagues have attained in the control of the policy-making of the university. With universities growing so rapidly and depending so vitally on financial support from the outside public, the ideal of the completely autonomous self-governing academic body has little relevance to North American conditions. And the history of Oxford and Cambridge, those Utopias which are com-

pletely controlled by their academic citizens, does not lend much support to the idea that it is wise to leave academic institutions over long periods altogether free from outside interference. This control by the outside public is now exercised on this continent through boards of regents or governors; and the legal relationship between them and the professor has been established as that of employer and employee. The problem then becomes that of modifying this legal relationship by the growth of constitutional custom.

What we should aim at is the building up of an acceptable form of security of tenure and a recognized system of due process in the appointment and dismissal of professors, and in the appointment of heads of departments, deans and presidents. The establishment of this due process will involve many unpleasant struggles in the future history of the C.A.U.T.; and the struggles are bound eventually to centre around the ultimate question of how much share the professorial body should have in the powers exercised by the president and board of governors. For the real work of the university is done by the academic staff in their teaching and research; the function of the administration is merely to provide the material basis on which this work can be done effectively. The members of the board of governors are not likely to be individuals capable of either teaching or research at their higher levels, or even capable of judging when teaching or research is being done efficiently by others. That the university scholar or scientist should be treated as an employee of theirs is outrageous. So what must be brought about is a far-reaching change in the balance of power within the university. As to what particular constitutional forms should emerge from this struggle, there are many in this audience more qualified to speak than I am.

I insert here a quotation from Professor Arthur Lower's presidential address in 1953 on *The Canadian University* to Section II of the Royal Society of Canada.

"For the loss by academics of the right of self-government there are many explanations . . . English Canada has little respect for the intellectual as such . . . Canadian life has been one long eulogy of the practical man, whether he be farmer, business-man, engineer, politician or soldier . . . How that worked out in institutions of higher learning I hardly need to say. Has there ever been a professor, I wonder, who when presented with the opportunity to abandon the life of contemplation for the life of action has not jumped at the chance to become head of this, director of that, dean of the other thing? Has there ever been a registrar or

bursar whose stature, by some means or another, has not been made to seem a little larger than that of the mere teacher? Open any calendar and you are confronted with a list of "Officers of Administration", followed later by "Teaching Staff". The names of officers of administration should be printed in small type at the back of the book . . . Without wishing in any way to offend my numerous good friends who are administrators, I must nevertheless maintain that the administrator, as such, is at best a necessary evil."

The central question is the position of the president. When I was lecturing on modern British constitutional history, I used to be fond of quoting from a German scholar, Wilhelm Dibelius, about the change in the positions of the monarch and the prime minister. "In the eighteenth century the prime minister got his importance from the fact that he was the only person in the realm who had the right of constant access to the monarch; today the monarch gets his importance from the fact that he is the only person in the realm who has the right of constant access to the prime minister." In our universities today there are too many professors and departments who get their importance not from their own intrinsic intellectual virtues but from the fact that they enjoy a special access to the president. The university will be in a healthy condition when the president gets his importance from the fact that he is the only person in the academic community with the opportunity of constant access to the most dynamic, imaginative and intellectually creative of the university's professors and departments.

Today the president gets too much of his importance from the fact that he is the only person in the university community with the right of constant access to the board of governors. He enjoys this monopoly thoroughly; and he won't welcome the intrusion of professors into his monopoly because professors can't be manipulated by him like big business tycoons. But this position will have to be reduced from that of a lusty Tudor Henry VIII or Elizabeth I to something like that of a modern constitutional monarch.

The president also gets too much of his importance from the fact that he is the chief channel of communication between the university and the outside world. And it is on this relationship, that of the university with the community at large, that the academic freedom of professors ultimately depends. The C.A.U.T. has hitherto devoted most of its attention to intra-mural questions. It seems to me that it needs to do a good deal more thinking about the extra-mural rela-

tions of the university. If the university is to be free, it must manage to communicate to the outer world a much fuller understanding of what it is doing and why its freedom is essential to a free society.

How can the community at large attain to any real understanding of what a university is, as a community of scientists and scholars, if it gets its image of a university from the typical university president? How can it believe that the university is anything but some form of organized hypocrisy when it hears speeches on the need for individuality, other-directedness, non-conformity, from presidents who are so obviously themselves perfect examples of the proper, well-adjusted organization man? How can it be led to see that it is the duty of a scientist or scholar to take a stand on what he believes to be the truth regardless of whether this truth is popular or not, and that taking such a stand is good for the freedom of the community itself, when the university is personified for it by one of these itinerant academic rotarians who never takes a stand on any concrete issue unless he is sure that most of the public (or, at least, most of the Establishment) are with him? Most of our university presidents are too much like most of our Christian clergymen; their sermons are merely against sin. Or they are too much like the bland, unexcited and uncommitted diplomats whom we now send forth from the Department of External Affairs to settle the problem of the cold war by preaching togetherness. But a university scholar or scientist should be a passionate, dedicated, highstrung seeker after truth who is only at home in a society based on free discussion, i.e. in a society in which differences of opinion and controversy are considered normal and healthy.

I do not know what exactly we university men collectively are to do about this problem of communicating with the public. Yet our freedom as individuals in expounding what we believe to be the truth depends ultimately upon the success of this communication.

The first obstacle in the way is the character of the modern university itself. For it has become a Tower of Babel whose workers no longer communicate very successfully with one another. Scientists and humanists belong to two separate cultures between which there looms an ever-widening gulf.<sup>1</sup> They no longer even try to understand

---

<sup>1</sup>On the gulf between the scientific and the humanistic culture see Sir Charles Snow's Cambridge lecture reprinted in *ENCOUNTER*, June and July, 1959.



each other. In the last bulletin of the Humanities Association there is printed a talk to his fellow humanists by Professor Priestley of Toronto in which he refers to scientists as "gentiles". When you use such a term, even facetiously, you are of course asserting that you and your fellows in the humanities are a chosen people. And since science in our modern civilization is the path to power, the hubris of the scientists when they refer to the humanists is even more insulting. Natural scientists now seem to communicate with each other mainly in mathematical symbols. Our literary humanists, with their unmathematical myths and symbols and archetypal patterns through which they claim to have access to a higher and holier form of truth than is available to scientists, have fallen prey to a mania for non-communication with the rest of the world. Our social scientists, especially our sociologists, strive for status by developing a pretentious jargon which frequently makes them unintelligible, so I am told, even to one another. Etc. Etc. The large university resembles one of those coral islands in the Pacific in which each little insect leaves its little deposit of coral shell unconscious of what its fellow insects are doing but buoyed up presumably by the faith that somewhere in a coral heaven is a great coral God who understands what it is all about. But the essence of coral insects is that they do not communicate.

The nature of our Canadian national community constitutes a second obstacle in the way of effective communication between it and the university. It is unnecessary here to dwell on the general unintellectual quality, and antiintellectual tendencies, of our Canadian equalitarian democracy. But something should be said about the light which the recent Crowe case in United College, Winnipeg, throws on the instinctive attitude of Canadians outside the university on an issue of academic freedom. Winnipeg was, no doubt, rather fiercely divided in opinion on this case. But the significant thing was the ease with which the Winnipeg Establishment imposed its interpretation of the case on the rest of the community, or at least on the non-university part of it.

In my early days when I was a young university teacher in the University of Saskatchewan, back in the 1920's, I used to idealize Winnipeg as the intellectual capital at that time of English Canada. It was the home of J. W. Dafoe and the *Winnipeg Free Press*. And reading the *Free Press* editorials day by day, with their emphasis on broader national issues and on world affairs, you got the feeling that here was no provincial small town but a metropolitan centre in touch



with intellectual currents throughout the western world. How different is the situation today! The *Free Press* was unable to see any issue of principle in the Crowe case at all; it merely rejoiced in the restoration of harmony, togetherness, when the issue seemed to be settled. And Winnipeg sank back comfortably into petty parochial loyalties. As for the "disloyalty" of the troublesome professor (discovered by means of a stolen letter!), if to be critical of the head of your academic institution and to oppose his policies is to be disloyal to the institution itself, then I should say that, during the forty years in which I was a Canadian professor, a Gallup poll at any given moment would probably have discovered that anything up to fifty per cent of the Canadian professorate were disloyal in this sense and therefore should have been dismissed. The idea that you are not loyal unless you admire the head of your institution, and that he is in effect the institution for purposes of loyalty tests, is the idea on which modern big business corporations are run; but it is monstrous to apply it to an institution of higher learning. Yet this seems to have been the proposition to which practically all the Establishment in Winnipeg rallied, especially inside the United Church. Winnipeg has sunk to the intellectual and moral level of Toronto.<sup>1</sup> As Rupert Brooke remarked long ago, this is the fate which threatens all English-Can-

---

<sup>1</sup>My remarks about the intellectual and moral level of Toronto aroused the ire of the mayor of Toronto, who continued to fulminate on this subject for a week or more after my talk in Saskatoon, and who asserted that Toronto was a generous, tolerant and enlightened centre. Ironically enough, he had barely calmed down on this issue when the television star, Joyce Davidson, made her remarks about the lack of Canadian interest, as she saw it, in the royal visit to Canada. All the Toronto guardians of our British connection immediately started up in loud and righteous anger. And who was leading the pack against Miss Davidson's right to express her opinion in public? Why, none other than the mayor of generous, tolerant and enlightened Toronto.

This combination of incidents reveals something about the state of liberty in Canada. When the McCarthy troubles were afflicting American universities, we used to congratulate ourselves that there was no similar anti-communist witchhunt in our Canadian universities. We failed to note that we in Canada were calm because we had no such emotional involvement in China and Korea as had our American neighbors. We should not be too sure about our immunity against McCarthyism until we get into some issue that rouses the loyalist emotions of British Canada. We should avoid the temptation to compound for Canadian sins we are inclined to by damning those American sins we have no mind to.

adian urban communities as they grow bigger. "If they are good, they may become Toronto."

This leads to another consideration about our Canadian community. Why is it that English universities are freer from attack and from undesirable outside pressures than are our North American ones? One may answer that the English are still a deferential people, or point to the long tradition of freedom in English history. But there is one special element in English society which we do not enjoy. That is the functioning of an intellectual elite of which the universities are the centre and whose members are closely in touch with one another through continuous social intercourse and through intermarriage. They make up the upper ranks of politics, journalism, the civil service, the judiciary, the church, the armed services. An American academic committee which was examining the working of the Universities Grants Commission in Britain reported that the ultimate reason why it worked so well was that its members, from the universities and from the government, were all also members of the Athenaeum Club. The members of this elite tend to become a governing class. But it is to the elite of intelligence rather than that of power that I wish to draw attention. In this elite of intelligence many of the members do not possess much power or wealth. Some of them are born dissenters, non-conformists, who are always taking up the cause of some unpopular minority. And to this elite of intelligence new recruits are now regularly being added from the working classes via the Redbrick universities, some of them even via Oxbridge.

How would you identify this intellectual elite in Britain? They are the people who get their daily news from the *London Times* or the *Manchester Guardian* or the *Daily Telegraph* rather than from the *Daily Mirror*, *Express*, *Mail* or *Herald*. They are the people who read the *Observer* or *Sunday Times* on Sundays rather than the *News of the World*; who read weeklies like the *New Statesman*, the *Spectator*, the *Economist*, the *Listener*, the *Times Literary Supplement*, *Punch*; who read monthlies like *Encounter*, the *Twentieth Century*, the *Contemporary Review*; who have listened to the Third Programme on the B.B.C. These elite journals are all edited and written by university men for university men. And these people, writers and readers, are arguing all the time about politics or philosophy or literature or art. They are continuously educating one another. Those of them interested in politics work in the Fabian Society or the Conservative Political Centre and sit on committees that draft statements of party policy.

My main point is that in England the universities form the very centre of this elite society. It is always there, alert and active, to act as an interpreter between the university and mass democratic society. Nothing is so apt to strike a Canadian university man sojourning in England so forcibly as the fact that, while English universities do not go in for our Madison Avenue techniques in keeping touch with their alumni, there always seems to be a very effective alumni group who understand what a university is and why its freedom is essential to society as a whole. The group consists of this intellectual elite whom I have been trying to describe.

In the United States there has been growing up in the twentieth century a similar group, though it is not yet so coherent or so conscious of itself as a group with a special outlook in society. With its continental area, the United States does not possess daily newspapers who can concentrate on a university readership like the *London Times* and the *Manchester Guardian*. But the *New York Times* has almost this position; it doesn't have to function as an entertainment agency for the New York masses as well as a newspaper for the educated elite. And the United States is full of quality weeklies and monthlies and quarterlies. Note especially the university quarterlies which issue now from almost every college of any size. Note also the high-class journals published for special religious groups, like *Commentary*, the *Commonweal*, the *Christian Century*. The essential characteristic of all these journals is that they are written by university men for university men. (In Canada we have only the United Church Observer!)

In spite of the proclivity of the organized American university alumni for football teams and drunken class reunions, this phenomenon of high-class journals shows that there has developed a nucleus of university graduates who are well aware of what a university stands for in the modern community. It was these people who sprang to the defence of the university professorial body when the McCarthy fever was at its height. It would pay us in Canada to examine more closely why it was that the Ivy League colleges, who were the main targets of the McCarthy attack, came through those troubles with colours flying. Surely it was because they are located in New England where this intellectual elite has the longest history and the most pervasive influence, and where therefore traditions of academic freedom are most secure.

In Canada on the whole we lack this solid cohesive intellectual elite. The list of Canadian journals written by university men for university men that one could draw up would be a very short one. The high-brows and the upper-middlebrows who graduate from Canadian universities are scattered thinly across the country as yet. They do not form a society. They fail to draw together for mutual help when university freedoms are threatened. This is the great underlying threat to academic freedom in our country.

What about the masses themselves? Most of us in the university world have become defeatist on this subject. The great project of the early nineteenth century, that of extending to the masses a full share in the highest culture of the age, has been too much for us. And obviously a mass culture whose standards are set by Hollywood movies, commercialized television, and pulp magazines, is divided from our culture by what seems an almost impassable gulf. In politics our leaders have given up trying to educate the masses into an understanding of the complex issues that have to be decided in Ottawa or Washington; they have substituted for education a flamboyant propaganda campaign managed by some big advertising agency. The mark of the mass man is his refusal to stretch his intellect or imagination beyond the limits to which he is accustomed; and he is now flattered by all the mass communication agencies into believing that his standards are all that is needed. If we acquiesce in this situation our academic freedom will always be in danger of being swept away in some storm of mass emotion as in Nazi Germany; and in quiet times it will constantly be subject to erosion by mass pressures.

Our instrument for changing this situation should surely be our own university graduates. What becomes of all these young people who pour out from our university halls every spring? If we are defeatist about mass culture, surely the fault lies in ourselves. We must have failed to educate these university students properly when we had them in our hands. Otherwise they would now be acting as a leaven within our mass society; they would be helping to raise the level of public discussion in all fields, so that crude outbursts of ignorant prejudice against the freedom of universities and their professors would no longer be possible. If we are still in danger, it is because we have failed in our essential work of educating our own students.

And here finally I reach my conclusion and round off this long sermon with a proper quotation. Professor Metzger at the end of his



account of the development of academic freedom in the United States makes two statements. One is this: "No one can follow the history of academic freedom in this country without wondering at the fact that any society, interested in the immediate goals of solidarity and self-preservation, should possess the vision to subsidize free criticism and inquiry, and without feeling that the academic freedom we still possess is one of the remarkable achievements of man." But he also says: "The very weakness of the A.A.U.P. was a healthy reminder that there was no substitute for courage on the part of each professor. If this shall be the land of the free, it must also be the home of the brave." The best way to defend academic freedom is to exercise it.

### THE CROWE CASE AGAIN

As a result of the long series of events associated with the dismissal of Professor Harry Crowe and the eventual resignation of some 14 of his colleagues at United College, a good many people, some at Queens, some at Manitoba and some at United College, were out-of-pocket a considerable sum of money.

At the National Executive Council meeting in Saskatoon on June 7th, it was agreed that an opportunity should be provided for members of the university teaching profession in Canada, who were not immediately involved in these events, to share in the cost of the support which was so spontaneously and generously given at the time. Accordingly, the Council instructed the Executive and Finance Committee "to set up a fund to be raised by voluntary contributions from local association members out of which to reimburse individuals for out-of-pocket expenses in connection with the Crowe case. Surplus funds might be held as a contingent fund for use in case a similar situation might arise again."

The Executive and Finance Committee has asked the treasurers of local associations to take charge of the local canvas of members. The Committee suggests that contributions (maximum \$5.00) be sent to the local association treasurer who will forward the money in a lump sum to the Executive Secretary at the national office in Ottawa. Cheques should be made out to the local association.



## A TECHNOLOGIST LOOKS AT HUMANISM\*

John Hart

Carleton University, Ottawa

Scientists are under attack. We are attacked because we refuse to accept professional responsibility for the use that you, my auditors, make of the by-products of our research; that is, of our technology. Our attackers know little of science, they understand nothing of even the most feebly endowed and poorly trained scientific mind. They accuse us of over-specialization, particularly in our school and college education. We admit that we are, in outlook and training, specialists; to achieve any significant advance in our discipline, we just have to specialize. I shall explain how and why in a moment. But, please do not think for a moment that we are not interested in humanity; the queer thing is, that as we become more highly specialized, we also have to become more interested in the impact of our findings upon society. The point that I want to make is that we have no claims, as scientists, to say what mankind shall or shall not do. And, as a matter of fact, scientists who make such pronouncements are just as often wrong as they are right.

The moral responsibility for the sensible application of scientific achievements belongs not to the scientists but to students of the widest aspects of man's endeavor; to scholars whose proper study is humanity. Sometimes these scholars are members of university faculties of arts and social sciences, sometimes they are priests, sometimes they are professional writers. They are not scientists, they are proud of being not scientists; they are, they say, humanists.

One of the characteristics of the humanist is the very arrogance with which he is so ready to label the scientist. A recent committee on the humanistic aspects of science was composed of "individuals who are not practicing or professional scientists". In the reports of the proceedings, we read: "After three centuries of clamoring for recognition, no scientist can protest if his neighbors seek a full-length view." There's arrogance for you! The field is open and the view is there for all to see who are not too short-sighted.

I will try to give you a full-length view, and you may see why we are specialists. The scientist has to develop a fiendish devotion to

---

\*Reprinted from *The CBC Times*.

a single idea. He strips the idea of its accessories, he separates it from environment; consciousness is to him irrelevant in all but the most elementary and the most advanced concepts. He has to develop a model, based upon his daily experiences in the world; you might call it a theory or a hypothesis. He has a slavish dependence upon this model. The scientist makes his model of, say, a light beam, and says it behaves "*as if*" it were a wave of something or "*as if*" it were a bunch of particles travelling with a certain speed. By making this model, he can predict certain things, and the further he pursues his theory, the less like the everyday things around him does his model seem to become. In fact, as he follows the logical consequences of one theory to a thrilling conclusion, he finds that it melts in his hands, and he has to invent and investigate another less plausible model. It is just like Alice's egg; we are travelling from our everyday world in the direction of the boundary of all knowledge, only to find that it retreats from us at exactly our speed of approach. This perpetual retreat from the familiar things of our world epitomises the supreme contradiction in the phrase "ultimate truth". Only the student who has taken part in this retreat can appreciate the humility of science. The scientist breaks his problem down into component parts and goes hell-for-leather after one of them. If he does this, he is eventually faced in a very practical way with the nature of reality, and paradoxically, he may even become a humanist.

This attitude is, of course, reflected at all levels of scientific education. Science courses are highly specialized. They have to be so. But — and here is the beam in their own eye that our attackers must remove — specialization is inimical to the development of a humanist. The so-called scientific method has become flybait, particularly for the academic humanist; the non-science graduates of our universities are not humanists, they are specialists. We have professors of classical civilization, of religion, of sociology, but not one student of the grand concept of humanism, the glorious and tragic saga of mankind. "The specializing tendency is so strong," says Harcourt Brown, "that it seems improbable that we shall see a restoration of the old full richness of the humanities." But why not? Universities used to breed wonderfully unspecialized humanists — can they not do the same thing today? It is not the sciences but the humanities that are too specialized. The humanist has been literally hopelessly confused by the scientific attitude and unfortunately imagines that his own scholarship will similarly benefit from division and specialization.

Specialization has in turn led to a failure in cultural standards and in discipline; if the humanist is the arbiter of standards, he is of necessity the personification of self-control, and on this subject, the scientist has nothing to say. The human race needs self-discipline, the control of material wealth, of cultural and ethical standards and indeed, the self-control of consciousness itself as never before: if we fail to control ourselves, there is no shortage of other candidates for the role of Big Brother. The humanist can never be valued for the immediate product of his labor, as the technician is, but he can be, if he wishes, the highest-valued member of society, valued for the sake of his standards and self-discipline. If, on the other hand, he fails, our culture is left to the tender mercies of the financier, the labor organizer, the huckster and the soldier. It should be unnecessary for me to ask the humanists for standards, yet this I must do. Science has no standards of culture, no decorum relevant to any field but her own. We have to turn elsewhere — to the humanists.

You ask us scientists to tell you what to do with our discoveries? Scientists are specialists in a narrow field, and are not, as scientists, informed about the wider implications of man's endeavor. For this reason, there is something horribly fatuous about petitions and processions and conferences of scientists and scientific philosophers (yes, I include Russell), who are protesting their fear of nuclear weapons. They will not be heard for a number of reasons. Among these is the failure of our teachers in the humanities to do their job; the humanists have no processions or petitions because they have no message. The fact that the scientists' discoveries have precipitated the crisis is irrelevant; scientists have perforce to advance, and this is something that the humanist is only dimly aware of; in his groping he is terrified of the implications for him of advances in technology, insofar as he understands them; of the implications for the future of the world, he has not the faintest conception. Yet cannot we expect that morals, ethics and just plain self-discipline should advance as fast as our technology?

So, we demand a positive lead from the humanists. We need men with a deep understanding of humanism in its highest sense. We need less study of knowledge and more pondering of wisdom, first in the universities, then in the governments of nations, and finally in the councils of the world. We need thunderers, roarers, who are men of goodwill and true humanity. *You* come forward and speak your minds or *we* perish.

## **SALARIES AND QUALIFICATIONS OF WOMEN TEACHING IN CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES\***

Now for the first time authoritative information is available concerning salaries and qualifications of women teaching in institutions of higher learning in Canada. A recent report issued by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics<sup>1</sup> gives some of the data separately for men and for women.

This report, for the academic year 1958-1959, provides information from 59 institutions employing roughly 80 per cent of Canada's 6,610 full-time university and college teachers. The increase of about 10 per cent in the number of teachers since the preceding year more than kept pace with the growth in student enrolment.

As nearly as can be determined all institutions with 1,000 or more full-time university students were included in the survey. The salary information is as at November 1, 1958 and is limited to lay teachers and religious teachers paid on the same basis as lay teachers. Salary data refer to basic annual salary rates only, although the report notes that "many teachers receive extra income for teaching evening, extension or summer classes, and many earn income from non-university sources."

Of course salaries and qualifications of both men and women are subject to many of the same influences. For example, pay in some fields of knowledge is generally higher than in others, depending on the length of preparation required and the demand and supply of personnel. Experience is important too, and it is noticeable that salaries vary in different regions of Canada. In 1958-1959 the median salary was highest in the Western provinces, followed by Ontario, Quebec and the Atlantic provinces. Regional variations are related not only to the local economic climate but probably also to a considerable extent to the size of the institutions in the area. The report

---

\*Reprinted from *The Labour Gazette* of November 30, 1959. Prepared for The Women's Bureau of the Department of Labour by Mrs. Svanhuit Josie.

<sup>1</sup>*Salaries and Qualifications of Teachers in Universities and Colleges, 1958-1959*, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Education Division, 1959, the Queen's Printer, Ottawa, \$1.00.



states that "in general, the larger the institution the higher was the median salary of teachers".

Keeping in mind that differences in salaries and qualifications of men and women are influenced by many other factors than the sex of the person occupying the position, it is still possible to make some interesting comparisons that illuminate the position of women in university teaching.

First it should be mentioned that of the full-time teachers reported, 11 per cent were women. This is a smaller proportion of women than the 1951 Census classed as "professors and college principals" (15 per cent).<sup>1</sup>

### *Qualifications:*

One measure of qualifications for university teaching is the highest earned university degree. On the whole, the academic degrees achieved by women teaching in Canada's institutions of higher learning were not as high as those of the men. For example, only one in five of the women paid as lay personnel held the doctorate whereas 46 per cent of the men had achieved this highest academic degree. The largest group of women teachers (44 per cent) had earned the master's degree. Roughly 23 per cent of the women as compared with 12 per cent of the men had no degree beyond the first baccalaureate. There was also a higher proportion of women than of men (7 per cent as against less than 2 per cent) with no university degree.

In university teaching, qualifications are also measured by experience. There is no direct evidence in the report concerning this matter, but some light is thrown on experience by tabulation of the number of years that have elapsed since granting of the first degree. Comparison of men and women on this score is open to the objection that the working life of women, particularly those who are married, — and there is no information about marital status — is likely to be interrupted. With this reservation in mind it is noted that roughly the same proportion of men and of women teaching in these institutions of higher learning earned their first degrees less than 10 years ago (29 per cent of the men and 28 per cent of the women). When the total group is divided according to decades

---

<sup>1</sup>The data are not strictly comparable as some who would come within the Census definition would not be included in this survey.



that have elapsed since graduation, these recent graduates make up the largest number of women teachers.

The largest group of men in the profession graduated in the next earlier decade, i.e., they earned their first degrees 10 years but less than 20 years ago. More than a third of all men teachers graduated during that period. On the other hand, a somewhat higher proportion of women than of men received the first degree at least 30 years ago.

#### *Field of Knowledge and Position Occupied:*

Qualifications of teachers in universities and colleges are, naturally, related both to the fields of knowledge in which they specialize and to the duties and responsibilities associated with the positions they hold. When positions are ranked in order of status from dean to professor, associate professor, assistant professor, ungraded professor and finally lecturer or instructor, it is seen that more than half of the men were assistant professors or above, whereas over 70 per cent of the women occupied positions below the rank of assistant professor. The largest group of women (36 per cent) was made up of lecturers or instructors. Among the men, assistant professors constituted the greatest number (28 per cent).

Since 45 per cent of all those reported are employed in the broad area of arts and science (excluding pure science), it is not surprising that this is the main field of employment for university teachers of both sexes. Women were represented on the teaching staff in all faculties shown in the report, with the single exception of engineering, applied science. However, concentration of women in certain areas is noticeable. With the exception of arts and science, which occupied 46 per cent of the men and 32 per cent of the women, faculties employing the greatest number of women were household science, education, and nursing, all concerned with what is traditionally considered to be women's work. For the men the most important fields of employment were after arts and science: engineering, applied science; medicine, and agriculture, in that order.

#### *Salaries:*

The median salary for women was \$6,000 and for men \$7,304. These were up from \$5,507 and \$6,739 respectively the year before. Generally speaking, salaries increased with the passage of years after graduation with the first degree until, for both sexes, the peak

of earnings was reached 40 to 44 years after first graduation. Thereafter median earnings declined, perhaps due to some persons undertaking less responsible work in their later years.

Men tend to have an advantage over women both in qualifications and in responsibility and seniority of positions occupied, and they are also found in larger numbers in the higher paid fields. It was not unexpected therefore to find that men's salaries were, on the whole, higher than those paid to women. The highest median salaries were in the faculties of dentistry (\$9,200), medicine (\$8,718) and Law, (\$8,625), in all of which the proportion of women teachers was small (5, 8 and 1 per cent respectively). Next in order were theology, education, agriculture, pharmacy, architecture and engineering, all with medians of \$7,000 or over.

Below the \$7,000 median were arts and science, social work, pure science, commerce, household science, music, nursing, physical and health education and physio — and occupational therapy. The report observes that "household science, nursing and physio — and occupational therapy, the faculties in which women teachers were in the majority, were among the five with lowest median salaries". This may be due in part to the smaller proportion in these lines of work who hold advanced degrees or extra-heavy responsibilities. However, the data show that even for the same level of academic or professional degree, median salaries for men were higher than for women. It is also noted that "in each rank (i.e., from dean down to lecturer) the median salary for women was lower than that for men. For all ranks combined it was \$1,304 lower, or 82.1 per cent of the median for men".

## Teaching Positions Open

Owing to a retirement and the increasing enrolment McMaster University is appointing two new members in the Department of English, one as Lecturer, the other at more senior rank depending upon qualifications. Starting salaries at current levels begin July 1st, 1960; academic duties begin September 1st. Preference will be given to applicants holding the Ph.D. degree, the senior post also requiring several years of successful university teaching. Courses to be taught include Old and Middle English, History of the English Language, Advanced Composition, and other fields of English literature.

Applications, including the usual curriculum vitae and names of references, should be mailed before February 1st, 1960, to:

H. S. ARMSTRONG,  
Dean of Arts and Science,  
McMaster University,  
HAMILTON, Ontario.

## **NEWS ITEMS**

### **Commonwealth Association of University Teachers**

At the annual meeting in Edmonton in June, 1958, the C.A.U.T. agreed to join in a proposed Commonwealth Association of University Teachers. It was made clear at that time that the purpose of this new association would simply be to facilitate close relations between associations of university teachers within the Commonwealth, and to encourage the growth of healthy national associations in all countries of the Commonwealth.

This year the first concrete steps are being taken to put this new Association on its feet. Included in the provisional organization are the Associations of University Teachers of the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada. A constitution is now being drafted, and at the same time efforts are being made to bring in as many other national associations as now exist. It is likely that such efforts may also contribute to the forming of national associations of teachers where they have not yet been formed.

### **Commonwealth Education Conference**

There was held in Oxford during July, 1959, a Commonwealth Education Conference — a conference which resulted from the decision reached at the Montreal conference of Finance Ministers in September, 1958, to set up one thousand scholarships for advanced study within the Commonwealth. A plan covering more than one thousand scholarships for advanced study in all fields was set up at Oxford. Of these 500 will be offered by the United Kingdom, 250 by Canada, and the remainder by other Commonwealth countries. In addition the Oxford Conference developed plans for a substantial expansion of technical assistance in the field of education for the training of teachers and the strengthening of the educational systems of underdeveloped parts of the Commonwealth.

The planned system of scholarships is aimed at increasing the flow of scholars of high attainment within the Commonwealth. The scholarships will be awarded by the country in which the scholar proposes to study. While a large proportion of them will be for the purpose of giving advanced training in the more advanced countries such as the United Kingdom and Canada, the plan envisages a flow

of scholars outward from these countries to those areas which do not now attract advanced students. A limited number of these awards will be made to senior scholars of established reputation. The plan has been described as an attempt to share as widely as possible the educational resources of the Commonwealth, "to bring about the widest possible variety of cultural exchange between all parts of the Commonwealth and so facilitate the development of a multilateral trade in ideas."

The Canadian proposals at the Oxford Conference were prepared after consultation between the N. S. C. U. and the government departments concerned, and many of the Canadian representatives at the Conference were drawn from the Canadian universities. One of the matters agreed at the Oxford Conference was that the plan should be administered in each country by an independent agency of government in which the universities would be represented. The United Kingdom has already announced that it will set up a statutory commission for this purpose, while the Prime Minister of Canada has announced that steps are being taken to set up a Canadian agency. It is intended that the Commonwealth Scholarships plan will be in operation by the 1960-61 session.

### **D.B.S. 1959-60 Salary Survey**

Median salaries of full-time teaching staff at the four universities (British Columbia, Alberta, Toronto and McGill) with over 5,000 enrolment (if students at affiliated institutions are excluded) showed another marked increase for 1959-60 over earlier years, according to a DBS advance release. The 1959-60 median for deans was \$15,875 (up 28.3% over 1956-57), for professors \$12,175 (39.6%), for associate professors \$9,141 (35.9%), for assistant professors \$7,251 (31.8%), and for instructors and lecturers \$5,502 (32.1%). For all staff, including a small group of ungraded professors, the 1959-60 median was \$8,035, up 6.2% over 1958-59, 16.3% over 1957-58, and 29.5% over 1956-57.

A more detailed analysis of salaries at these and thirteen other institutions will be available in two or three months in the DBS publication *Salaries and Qualifications of Teachers in Universities and Colleges, 1959-60*. Additional advance releases will appear in the *DBS Daily Bulletin*, probably late in November.

*From DBS Daily Bulletin Nov. 12, 1959.*



## STAFFING THE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES OF CANADA

With support from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Canadian Universities Foundation (executive agency of the N.C.C.U.C.) established a research and information service in 1958. The first major study undertaken was the problem of staffing our universities and colleges. What follows is a resume of Part 1 of this study — *Projection of Enrolment and Staff Requirements to 1970-71*. Single copies of this report may be obtained free of charge. Orders for more than one copy of any part should be accompanied by payment of 10¢ per copy. Write to the Canadian Universities Foundation, 77 Metcalfe Street, Ottawa 4.

University enrolment is increasing rapidly and is certain to increase markedly in the future. More teachers will be needed. How many more? More teachers will be needed not only to replace those who resign, retire or die, but primarily because more students are expected in the years ahead. How many more students?

In a projection prepared for the 1955 meeting of the N. C. C. U. (1), enrolment of full-time university students was shown as rising to 82,200 in 1958-59 and 128,900 in 1964-65. A later calculation (2) yielded an enrolment figure of 133,000 for 1964-65, rising to 192,000 in 1970-71 and to 267,000 in 1979-80. D.B.S. (3) has estimated that the actual enrolment in 1958-59 was 94,400. This figure is 14.8% greater than the 1955 projection.

For the purpose of this study, still another enrolment projection has been made based on the trend in the relationship between enrolment and college-age population between the years 1953-54 to 1958-59. It yields figures 149,200 in 1964-65 and 229,100 in 1970-71.

According to D.B.S. estimates (4), the ratio of full-time students to full-time teachers in the academic ranks was 14.1 to 1 in 1956-57, 14.5 to 1 in 1957-58, and 14.3 to 1 in 1958-59. The actual numbers of full-time teachers in these years were, respectively, 5,540, 5,980, and 6,610.

If one accepts the enrolment projection made above, and assumes that the student-staff ratio remains at 14.3 to 1, the number of teachers required in 1970-71 will be about 16,072. This figure is the number of teachers that will be required on staff rather than the number that



must be recruited. Evidently the number to be recruited in order that staff requirements may be met will depend on the annual rate of loss for all reasons from teaching ranks. Data now being collected from the universities will make it possible to estimate the total numbers to be recruited each year. The next question is: Where can these teachers be found?

- (1) E. F. Sheffield, "Canadian University and College Enrolment Projected to 1965". Proceedings of the N.C.C.U., 1955, pp. 39-46.
- (2) Yves Dubé, J. E. Howes, and D. L. McQueen, "Housing and Social Capital" (A study for the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects), 1957, Table 26.
- (3) D.B.S. Education Division, Higher Education Section, *Fall Enrolment in Universities and Colleges 1958*, p. 5.
- (4) D.B.S. Education Division, Higher Education Section, *Salaries and Qualifications of Teachers in Universities and Colleges*, 1956-57 p. 18, 1957-58, p. 25, 1958-59, p. 23.



## New Books

### THE HISTORY AND ORIGIN OF LANGUAGE

By A. S. Diamond. A work of great originality, written from the sociological point of view, for layman, as well as linguist. Dr. Diamond has been a Master of the Supreme Court in Britain since 1952. Has studied human language for thirty years. \$6.00

### WILFRED GRENFELL

#### *His Life and Work*

By J. Lennox Kerr. "The pages are crowded with incidents that challenge alike mind and heart. Grenfell's missionary stature grows steadily in both missionary and medical history, and this volume is tremendously significant and timely." — Daniel A. Poling. \$4.00

### LIFE OF JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY

By F. H. Lea. The first biography of one of the most controversial figures in recent English literary life. He was the foremost literary critic of his day, author of forty books, friend of D. H. Lawrence and husband of Katherine Mansfield. \$6.00

### MEDICINE TODAY

By Marguerite Clark. A report on progress in medicine, written for laymen. The author is Medicine Editor of Newsweek and is regarded as the leading medical journalist in the United States today. She spot-lights a world which few laymen ever see. \$6.00

### THE RYERSON PRESS

299 QUEEN STREET WEST,  
TORONTO 2-B, CANADA

## WUS ANNOUNCES SUMMER COURSES ABROAD 1960

#### Featuring:

- Unlimited free time
- Transatlantic travel
- Lectures by European Professors
- Travel Now — Pay later plan available
- Every program, complete, under \$700.00
- Preliminary program in London with each course
- Programs in
  - LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
  - ART AND ARCHITECTURE
  - MUSIC FESTIVALS
  - PAINTING

#### *Applications from*

**WUS SUMMER COURSES**  
**22 WILLCOCKS STREET,**  
**TORONTO 5, ONTARIO.**

## Canadian COMMENTATOR

**2382 DUNDAS STREET WEST,**  
**TORONTO, ONT., LE. 3-7958**

*An Independent Magazine on  
National and International Affairs*

#### *Editor in Chief:*

DR. MARCUS LONG

*Ottawa Correspondent.....*John Stevenson  
*Economics.....*W. F. Logheed  
*Arts .....*Mavor Moore  
*Washington Correspondent.....*James M. Minifie  
*London Correspondent.....*Charles Taylor  
*Foreign Affairs.....*John Gellner

#### *Publisher:*

W. H. BAXTER

---

*Please send me a sample copy*

Name.....

Address.....

**Subscription Rate \$3.00 per year**





## You'll wonder why you've never been before...

Whether it's your first trip or your tenth, you always see something in Europe that makes you feel that way. For Europe has so much for everyone—from oompapah to art treasures, from bed and breakfast at the "Pig and Whistle" to dinner at Maxim's.

These days, you don't have to be wealthy to go to Europe—indeed, once you get there, almost *all* prices are lower than at home! And getting there costs little enough when you think of the riches you'll have stored up for the rest of your life. For example, the Montreal-London

Economy round-trip costs \$453.60, Montreal-Vienna, \$570.60. With TCA's "Pay later" plan you can budget your fare *or* the cost of a complete vacation, if you wish.

Start planning a trip now—that's a pleasure in itself! Mail the postcard for colourful TCA literature. Or see your Travel Agent or TCA Office. As well as the most popular service between Canada and Europe, TCA also offers you frequent flights across all Canada, to the United States and Bermuda, Nassau and the Caribbean.

TRANS-CANADA AIR LINES

when **\$45<sup>36</sup>** down takes you to Europe with



# TCA



# DAILY

## NON-STOP to EUROPE BY LUXURIOUS DC-7C's

from

### MONTREAL and NEW YORK

See your TRAVEL AGENT, or call KLM

Offices in Principal  
Canadian Cities



GO **CNR** NOW-PAY LATER

**LOW**  
**Christmas Fares**  
**FOR TEACHERS  
AND STUDENTS**

Now  
available for  
as little as

**10%**  
**DOWN**

- By train in Canada or to anywhere in North America.
- Covers transportation, meals, hotels, sightseeing . . . even all-expense "Package" Tours.
- \$100.00 minimum, 10% down, up to 24 months to pay, depending on balance.

Ask your Canadian National Passenger Representative, or any Travel Agent.

**GO BY TRAIN**  
**CANADIAN NATIONAL** **PAY LATER**

## QUALITY PRESS Limited

A COMPLETE PRINTING  
SERVICE

- BOOKS
- MAGAZINES
- CATALOGUES

1030 ST. ALEXANDER ST.  
Tel. UNiversity 6-1811  
MONTREAL



“You may stop  
a man’s mouth  
by crammin’ a book  
down his throat,  
but you won’t  
convince him.”

*Sam Slick’s Wise Saws;  
Thomas Chandler Haliburton, 1853*

**IMPERIAL OIL  
LIMITED**

—from the Imperial Oil collection.

## **APPLIED HYDRODYNAMICS**

By H. R. VALLENTINE, Associate Professor of Civil Engineering, The University of New South Wales.

**\$10.00**

The book is intended for use in universities as an introduction to Hydrodynamics for students of Applied Mathematics, and as a course in Fluid Dynamics for senior and post-graduate students in Civil, Mechanical and Aeronautical Engineering. It has a bias towards practical application, differing from those established hydrodynamic works which are essentially mathematical treatises.

## **ION EXCHANGE - A Laboratory Manual**

By J. E. SALMON, Ph.D., F.R.I.C. Head of Chemistry Department, Battersea College of Technology and D. K. Hale, M.A., National Chemical Laboratory.

**\$5.00**

This laboratory manual is prefaced with an account of the fundamental principles in terms which would be understood by fifth-year pupils in high schools and first-year students in universities. It includes details of many practical experiments designed for both school and college use and also as a possible model for research in industrial applications.

**BUTTERWORTH & CO. (CANADA) LIMITED**

1367 Danforth Avenue,

Toronto 6, Ontario.

## C.A.U.T. MEMBER ASSOCIATIONS

<i>ASSOCIATION</i>	<i>Membership</i>	<i>President</i>	<i>Secretary</i>
Victoria .....	59	R. J. Bishop	Mrs. E. Kennedy
U.B.C. ....	580	J. K. Foulks	D. T. Kenny
Alberta .....	200	S. R. Sinclair	R. J. Crawford
Saskatchewan .....	227	K. W. Buckley	R. Skinner
Brandon .....	16	W. D. Smith	G. MacDowell
St. John's .....	18	W. S.F. Pickering	A. H. Hoole
United .....	45	A. G. Bedford	W. C. Campbell
Manitoba .....	264	R. A. Hedlin	F. M. Kelly
Western .....	150	R. W. Torrens	R. W. Packer
Waterloo .....	49	R. G. Woolford	J. D. Ford
Waterloo College .....	40	J. S. Stone	Mrs. J. G. Briggs
McMaster .....	107	H. A. Dulmage	H. A. Wood
O.A.C. ....	184	W. H. Brown	H. W. Goble
O.V.C. ....	55	F. J. Milne	T. J. Hulland
Toronto .....	405	R. M. Saunders	M. F. Grapko
Queen's .....	146	H. R.S. Ryan	C. H. R. Campling
Carleton .....	55	G. R. Love	D. C. Rowat
Ottawa .....	56	A. DesMarais	G. Dozois
Montreal .....	192	J. Saint-Pierre	M. Bouchard
McGill .....	320	M. Cohen	F. S. Howes
Sir Geo. Wms. ....	43	J. P. Zweig	J. H. Whitelaw
Bishop's .....	19	D. C. Masters	A. J. Motyer
Laval .....	173	G. Filteau	E. Gosselin
U.N.B. ....	90	E. D. Maher	A. L. Van Slyke
Mt. Allison .....	56	R. Barclay	H. A. MacLean
Acadia .....	16	N. H. Morse	Jean Marsh
St. F. X. ....	23	L. P. Chiasson	E. J. Monahan
Dalhousie .....	47	A. R. Bevan	R. V. Webber
Memorial .....	56	D. G. Pitt	P. Copes
29 Units .....	3691	People.	



# ***When is a Right a DUTY?***

Today everyone enjoys as his birthright, privileges which once were the possession of only a few. But his birthright also includes responsibilities with respect to the privileges he enjoys.

Education is one of the privileges which carry responsibilities. All of us have the responsibility, for example, of helping to ensure that every young person has the opportunity to complete his education, and of seeing that the quality of instruction at our schools and colleges is maintained at a high level.

Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada is preparing, for free distribution, a series of booklets on educational matters of importance. These booklets, issued as a public service, discuss problems in which all of us share responsibility. Inquiries about this series should be addressed to: Values in Education, Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada, Sun Life Building, Montreal.